

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03526 01 OF 02 222026Z

66

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01

SAM-01 NEA-14 DRC-01 /166 W
----- 126202

R 221700Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6444

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3526

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: JUNE 21 WG DISCUSSION OF DATA

REF: (A) STATE 130942; (B) STATE 125561

SUMMARY: DURING ALL-DAY SESSION ON DATA (OTHER AGENDA ITEMS BEING DEFERRED), WG JUNE 21 DISCUSSED DATA TABLES IN REFS (A) AND (B) WHICH US REP CIRCULATED. FOLLIWNG PRESENT SCENARIO, UK AND FRG ENDORSED NEW FIGURES FOR MBFR PURPOSES. DUTCH AND CANADIAN REPS, HOWEVER, ASKED HOW AIR DEFENSE ELEMENT AFFECTED NEW AGGREGATES, AND WONDERED WHY THE THREE ALLIES HAD NOT PROVIDED INFORMATION ON WHAT HAS BEEN HITHERTO A CONTINUING DIFFICULTY. UNCERTAINTY OF HOW NEW AGGREGATES WERE DERIVED, TOGETHER WITH FACT (WHICH UK SURFACED) THAT THERE MIGHT BE SOME DISAGREEMENT IN DETAILS WITHIN AIR DEFENSE SECTOR, PREVENTED ALLIES FROM ACCEPTING FIGURES FOR OWNWARD TRANSMISSION TO SPC. WG CHAIRMAN SAID HE WOULD CIRCULATE NEW AGGREGATES NATO-WIDE FOLLOWING US URGING TO SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03526 01 OF 02 222026Z

AT LEAST DISSEMINATE AS WIDELY AS POSSIBLE THOSE FIGURES WHICH US, UK AND FRG HAD CONFIRMED. IN ORDER TO RESOLVE PROBLEM AND GET ALLIES TO ACCEPT FIGURES AT NEXT WG MEETING, JULY 2, CHAIRMAN URGED US TO SEEK ANY NECESSARY CLARIFICATIONS. END SUMMARY.

1. FOLLOWING CAREFULLY WORKED OUT SCENARIO WITH UK, FRG AND WG CHAIRMAN, US REP INTRODUCED TABLES CONTAINED IN REFS (A) AND (B) AT JUNE 21 WG MEETING. IN EXPLAINING REF (A) DATA, US REP SAID THAT FOLLOWING DISCUSSIONS RECENTLY HELD BY UK AND THE FRG IN WASHINGTON, HE HAD NOW BEEN ASKED TO PUT FORWARD FOR ACCEPTANCE BY THE MBFR WORKING

GROUP FIGURES FOR NSWP SSM PERSONNEL AS WELL AS WP HELICOPTER PERSONNEL.

HE ADDED THAT THIS INFORMATION SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO ANNEX B OF THE WG'S DATA REPORT IN ORDER TO PROVIDE AHG COMPLETED DATA ON WP FORCES IN THE NGA.

2. TURNING TO REF (B) DATA, US REP SAID THAT DURING SAME DOUBLE BILATERAL US HAD MADE AVAILABLE TO UK AND FRG REPS REVISED ESTIMATES OF TOTAL WP AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER STRENGTHS IN THE NGA, VALID AS OF MID-YEAR 74. SINCE FIGURES CONTAINED IN ANNEXES A AND B OF WG'S DATA REPORT WERE VALID AS OF 31 DECEMBER 1973, AND IN ORDER TO PROVIDE AHG EXPEDITIOUSLY WITH MOST UP TO DATE INFORMATION AVAILABLE, HE ASKED THAT WG ACCEPT NEW FIGURES FOR MBFR PURPOSES ONLY, AND WITH CLEAR UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS WAS A TEMPORARY EXPEDIENT. HE ADDED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES INTENDED TO INTRODUCE THESE NEW ESTIMATES AT THE NEXT APPROPRIATE NATO INTELLIGENCE CONFERENCE, POSSIBLE THE MC/224 MEETING IN EARLY AUTUMN, AS A BASIS FOR DEVELOPING NEW AGREED FIGURES. AT THAT TIME, HE CONCLUDED, US WOULD BE PREPARED TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY BREAKDOWNS TO

EXPLAIN NEW FIGURES.

3. UK REP (ABRAHAMS) FOLLOWED US REP'S PRESENTATION WITH STATEMENT ENDORSING NEW AGGREGATE FIGURES AND COMMENT THAT AHG SHOULD BE APPRISED OF LATEST AGGREGATES TO ENSURE THAT ALLIES IN VIENNA WOULD NOT BE OPERATING ON THE BASIS OF OUTDATED FIGURES.

4. FRG REP (DZIALAS) SAID BONN COULD ACCEPT NEW AGGREGATE FIGURES SINCE THEY COINCIDED IN GENERAL WITH GERMAN NATIONAL HOLDINGS.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03526 01 OF 02 222026Z

FRG ACCEPTANCE WAS FOR MBFR PURPOSES ONLY, HOWEVER. BONN ALSO WELCOMED APPROACH OF HAVING FIGURES INTRODUCED SUBSEQUENTLY IN A FORMAL INTELLIGENCE CONFERENCE, FROM WHICH NATO AGREED FIGURES WOULD THEN EMERGE. FRG WAS NOT, HOWEVER, GIVING ITS APPROVAL FOR RELEASE OF FIGURES TO AHG, WHICH WAS TASK OF SPC. FRG'S ACCEPTANCE OF FIGURES WAS FURTHERMORE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO WHAT MIGHT BE DISCUSSED AT A SUBSEQUENT INTELLIGENCE CONFERENCE, AT WHICH TIME THE FRG RESERVED THE RIGHT TO SEEK FURTHER MODIFICATIONS ON SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF NEW AGGREGATES.

5. CHAIRMAN (MINTER) SAID IT WOULD SEEM REASONABLE FOR ALLIES IN VIENNA TO HAVE BEST AVAILABLE INFORMATION FOR THEIR INTERNAL USE, AS OPPOSED TO WHAT NOW APPEARED TO BE OUTDATED INFORMATION CONTAINED IN WG'S DATA REPORT. SPEAKING FROM TECHNICAL LEVEL, HE SAID IT

WOULD BE IN ALLIED INTEREST TO ACCEPT NEW FIGURES EXPEDITIOUSLY BUT THAT SPC WOULD, OF COURSE, HAVE TO RULE ON WHAT FIGURES WOULD BE TRANSMITTED TO AHG, AND FOR WHAT PURPOSES THEY COULD BE USED. GIVEN FACT THAT US, UK AND FRG COULD AGREE TO NEW AGGREGATES, HE WONDERED WHETHER OTHER ALLIES COULD NOW ACCEPT THEM AS AN INTERIM EXPEDIENT AS US HAD SUGGESTED, AND WITH FORMAL CONFIRMATION AS NATO AGREED DATA TO AWAIT A FORTHCOMING INTELLIGENCE CONFERENCE.

6. DUTCH REP (SIZOO) EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR WORK THAT THREE ALLIES HAD UNDERTAKEN ON BEHALF OF OTHERS, AND SAID THAT IN PRINCIPLE NETHERLANDS WAS GENERALLY PREPARED TO ACCEPT ANY FIGURES WHICH THE THREE ALLIES WITH INTELLIGENCE-GATHERING CAPABILITIES COULD AGREE TO. HE EXPRESSED SURPRISE, HOWEVER, THAT US HAD NOT EXPLAINED HOW NEW AGGREGATES HAD BEEN DERIVED. WERE INCREASES DUE TO THE THREE ALLIES HAVING BEEN ABLE TO AGREE ON AIR DEFENSE ANOMALIES AND/OR DID INCREASES RESULT FROM NEW EVIDENCE ON EXISTING FORCES? IF THE LATTER, ALLIES SHOULD BE TOLD HOW DEFINITIVE NEW EVIDENCE WAS. PROCESS OF IDENTIFYING NEW EVIDENCE COULD BE A CONTINUING ONE, AND FIGURES MIGHT WELL CHANGE AGAIN. IT WOULD THUS BE IMPORTANT FOR ALLIES TO KNOW DETAILS OF HOW AGGREGATES WERE DEVELOPED BEFORE THEY WERE ASKED TO ACCEPT NEW TOTALS, EVEN FOR MBFR PURPOSES.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03526 02 OF 02 222041Z

66

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01

SAM-01 NEA-14 DRC-01 /166 W
----- 126218

R 221700Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6465

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3526

7. CANADIAN REP (BECKETT) SAID THAT IN GENERAL CANADA ALSO WAS PREPARED TO ACCEPT FIGURES FULLY AGREED TO BY THE THREE MAJOR INTELLIGENCE PRODUCERS. WHILE ECHOING DUTCH REP'S APPRECIATION OF WORK THAT HAD BEEN ACCOMPLISHED, HE NOTED THAT DETAILS ON

RESOLUTION OF AIR DEFENSE PROBLEM WERE NOT INCLUDED IN US SUBMISSION, ALTHOUGH THIS PRESUMABLY WAS ONE OF THE MAJOR REASONS FOR THE RECENT DISCUSSIONS. SUCH INFORMATION, HE FELT, MIGHT HELP ANSWER DUTCH REP'S QUESTION. UK REP SAID THAT AS FAR AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, PROBLEM OF AIR DEFENSE ANOMALIES WERE NOW RESOLVED IN NEW AGGREGATE FIGURES. CANADIAN REP THEN REJOINED THAT ALLIES SHOULD AT LEAST BE TOLD HOW THIS HAD BEEN DONE, AND BELIEVED TABLES ILLUSTRATING THE NEW RESOLUTION SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO WG. UK REP REPLIED THAT, AGAIN AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, THIS WORK

HAD BEEN DONE, BUT THAT AT THE LAST MOMENT THERE APPEARED TO BE THE

POSSIBILITY OF SOME DISAGREEMENT ON SPECIFIC DETAILS OF UNIT COUNTING IN THE AIR DEFENSE SECTOR. SEE SEPTEL FOR DISCUSSION OF THIS
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03526 02 OF 02 222041Z

PROBLEM, WHICH AROSE PRIOR TO WG MEETING.

8. FACT THAT THERE NEW APPEARED TO BE SOME POSSIBLE DISAGREEMENT ON DETAILS BETWEEN US AND UK ENABLED THEREUPON HAVE LED DUTCH REP TO RE-EMPHASIZE HIS POINT THAT BREAKDOWNS SHOULD BE CLARIFIED BEFORE ALLIES WERE TO ACCEPT ANY NEW SET OF AGGREGATES. DANISH REP (KROGEN) ECHOED DUTCH VIEW, SAYING THAT IF ALLIES WERE NOT PERFECTLY CLEAR AS TO HOW NEW AGGREGATES WERE DERIVED, THEY WOULD NOT BE CERTAIN AS TO WHAT THEY WERE IN FACT AGREEING TO. POSSIBILITY IS THAT THE WP TOTALS MIGHT CONTINUE TO RISE, AS NEW EVIDENCE WAS DEVELOPED. THIS WAS A PROBLEM THAT SHOULD GIVE ALLIES PAUSE FOR THOUGHT BEFORE ACCEPTING FIGURES. HE ALSO WONDERED WHETHER RECENT DOUBLE BILATERALS HAD REVIEWED NATO FIGURES IN NGA AS WELL, SINCE THEY ALSO MIGHT HAVE RISEN DURING THE PAST SIX MONTHS.

9. CHAIRMAN REPLIED THAT WG SHOULD KEEP NATO FIGURES COMPLETELY SEPARATE FROM DISCUSSION OF NEW WP AGGREGATES. NATO FIGURES WERE CONSIDERED TO BE STABLE OVER A LONG PERIOD (E.G., ONE YEAR) AND TOOK INTO ACCOUNT SEASONAL FLUCTUATIONS.

10. US REP SAID THAT ALLIES SHOULD DISTINGUISH BETWEEN DEVELOPING A NEW ANNEX A AND A DETAILED ANNEX B. AT PRESENT, ALLIES IN VIENNA AND BRUSSELS NEEDED LATEST INFORMATION FOR THEIR OWN USE, AND THAT WG SHOULD CONSIDER REF (B) AGGREGATES AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR CURRENT ANNEX A. THE THREE ALLIES HAD AGREED TO THESE NEW AGGREGATES, AND THEREFORE AT LEAST THIS PART OF THE PROBLEM COULD BE ACTED ON NOW. IN EFFORT TO BE RESPONSIVE TO ALLIED CONCERNS AS TO HOW AGGREGATES WERE DEVELOPED, HE SAID HE WOULD UNDERTAKE TO ASK WASHINGTON IF US COULD PROVIDE ANY NECESSARY EXPLANATIONS PRIOR TO, RATHER THAN DURING, NEXT INTELLIGENCE CONFERENCE. DUTCH REP AGAIN STRESSED POINT THAT HE COULD NOT SEE HOW ALLIES SHOULD BE ASKED TO AGREE TO NEW TOTALS NOW WITHOUT HAVING EXPLANATIONS MADE AVAILABLE AS TO HOW THESE TOTALS WERE DEVELOPED.

11. IN ORDER TO MEET US AND UK VIEW THAT DATA SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED

AT AN EARLY DATE, BUT TAKING INTO ACCOUNT STRONG DUTCH RESISTANCE TO
ACCEPTANCE OF FIGURES AT THIS TIME, CHAIRMAN PROPOSED TO TRANSMIT
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03526 02 OF 02 222041Z

NATO-WIDE TO CAPITALS (WITH COPIES TO MICREP VIENNA) NEW AGGREGATES
JOINTLY CONFIRMED BY US, FRG AND UK. REPORT WOULD ALSO REFLECT
GENERAL WG VIEW THAT IT APPEARED REASONABLE FOR ALLIES TO WORK WITH
WHATEVER FIGURES THE THREE MAJOR INTELLIGENCE PRODUCERS COULD AGREE
TO. MEANWHILE, HE ASKED US REP TO SEEK ANY POSSIBLE CLARIFICATIONS
TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY DUTCH AND CANADIAN REPS. WG AGREED
TO COME BACK TO DATA ON JULY 2.

12. ON A RELATED ISSUE, IMS INTELLIGENCE REP NOTED THAT THE TERMS
OF REFERENCE FOR THE FORTHCOMING MC/224 CONFERENCE WERE CONFINED
TO GROUND FORCES, AND THAT AS A RESULT HE WOULD PROPOSE THAT AIR
ELEMENTS OF THE NEW AGGREGATES BE CIRCULATED TO CAPITALS FOR OUT-OF-
COMMITTEE AGREEMENT. THIS COULD BE DONE, OF COURSE, ONLY AFTER
WG HAD ACCEPTED THEM AT TECHNICAL LEVEL FOR MBFR PURPOSES. THERE
WERE NO COMMENTS, OTHER THAN US REP'S STATEMENT THAT HE WOULD
CHECK WITH WASHINGTON.

13. COMMENT: IN GENERAL, ALLIES IN WORKING GROUP SEEMED TO HAVE
NO DIFFICULTY WITH FACT THAT DOUBLE BILATERALS HAD BEEN HELD TO RESOLVE

CONTINUING DATA DIFFICULTIES, NOR DID THEY APPEAR TO OBJECT TO
THE IDEA OF ACCEPTING NEW AGGREGATES FOR MBFR PURPOSES ONLY.
PROPOSAL THAT THESE FIGURES WOULD THEN BE PUT TO A SUBSEQUENT
INTELLIGENCE CONFERENCE FOR CONFIRMATION SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN
PRIMARY REASON WHY THE INSTITUTIONAL QUESTION OF HOW NATO SHOULD
AGREE TO FIGURES FOR MBFR DID NOT BECOME A MAJOR PROBLEM IN THE
DISCUSSION. TO KEEP THIS QUESTION FROM INFLUENCING DEBATE, US
REP NOTED THAT WASHINGTON WAS CONSIDERING WAYS TO REGULARIZE THE
PROCESS OF ACCOMPLISHING FUTURE CHANGES IN DATA THIS IN A
FORMAL MANNER THROUGH EXISTING NATO MACHINERY (PER PARA ONE OF
REF (A)).

14. SINCE ALLIES SEEM TO HAVE NO BASIC DIFFICULTY IN ACCEPTING
NEED FOR NEW AGGREGATES FOR MBFR PURPOSES, AND SINCE PROBLEM
AROSE BECAUSE WE COULD NOT SATISFACTORILY EXPLAIN HOW THEY
WERE DERIVED, MISSION BELIEVES THAT WE WILL HAVE GOOD CHANCE OF
GAINING ACCEPTANCE OF FIGURES AT NEXT WG MEETING IF WASHINGTON
CAN PROVIDE EXPLANATION OF WHERE CHANGES IN AGGREGATES ACTUALLY
OCCURRED.

15. WE WILL NEED TO KNOW HOW TO REACT TO UK TABLES ON WP
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03526 02 OF 02 222041Z

AIR DEFENSE SECTOR (TEXT SEPTTEL), WITH AN INDICATION OF HOW THIS
ELEMENT INFLUENCES THE NEW AGGREGATES. WE WILL ALSO NEED TO
KNOW WHETHER ANY POSSIBLE DISAGREEMENTS IN AIR DEFENSE SECTOR

RELATE TO FRG FIGURES. FRG DEL IN NATO HAS NOT BEEN INFORMED OF WHAT WENT ON IN WASHINGTON, DOES NOT HOLD ANY AGREED FIGURES ARISING OUT OF DOUBLE BILATERALS, AND WOULD NOT HAVE HAD ANY INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUNE 21 WG MEETING HAD WE NOT PROVIDED THEM WITH ADVANCE COPY OF REF (A) AND (B) FIGURES WHICH THEY CABLED TO BONN. FRG DEL ALSO UNAWARE OF EXISTENCE OF TABLES. IN THE MEANTIME, WE HAVE AT LEAST SUCCEEDED IN HAVING NEW AGGREGATES CIRCULATED WITH A WG ENDORSEMENT THAT IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE FOR ALLIES TO RELY ON LATEST AND BEST AVAILABLE INFORMATION.

16. APPRECIATE WASHINGTON GUIDANCE WELL BEFORE JULY 2 WG MEETING, IN ORDER FOR US TO DO NECESSARY CORRIDOR WORK. END COMMENT.
MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 22 JUN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO03526
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740687/abbryvtr.tel
Line Count: 286
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) STATE 130942; (B) STATE 125561
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 22 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <22 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <09 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: JUNE 21 WG DISCUSSION OF DATA
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005